



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/692,634	10/24/2003	Daniel P. Brown	CS21907RA	8650
20280	7590	03/22/2007	EXAMINER	
MOTOROLA INC			HUANG, WEN WU	
600 NORTH US HIGHWAY 45				
ROOM AS437			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
LIBERTYVILLE, IL 60048-5343			2618	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			03/22/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Advisory Action Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>
	10/692,634	BROWN ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>
	Wen W. Huang	2618

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address--

THE REPLY FILED 16 February 2007 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a)  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b)  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### NOTICE OF APPEAL

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

#### AMENDMENTS

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).

5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.

6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).

7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

#### AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).

9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).

10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

#### REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: see attachment.

12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_

13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

**Advisory Action**

Applicant's arguments filed 2/16/07 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Regarding claim 1, Applicant first argues that Hanninen does not suggest or teach coordinating data collection by associating collected data with an incident because Hanninen does not describe any effort by the mobile terminal to ensure that the collected data is associated with an incident. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

More specifically, the Examiner submits that Hanninen teaches that the victim 210 makes an emergency call to the police using the mobile terminal 120 to associate the collected image and location data with a crime report (see Hanninen, col. 4, line 65 – col. 5, line 3). Furthermore, the Examiner also believes that because the image data is collected during the occurring of the incident; therefore, it is inherent that the collected data is associated with the incident. Thus, the Examiner submits that Hanninen teaches coordinating data collection by associating collected data with an incident.

Additionally, Applicant argues that Hanninen does not teach or suggest coordinating data collection by associating collected data with an incident because Hanninen only a single source of data. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

More specifically, the Examiner submits that claim 1 recites "at least ONE video sensor of the at least ONE remote device". Therefore, nowhere in claim 1 requires

multiple sources of data. Thus, Hanninen's teaching of a single data source meets the limitation recited in claim 1. Moreover, the Examiner submits that it is unreasonable to assume that Hanninen's teaching infers only one single victim (i.e. single data source) in a single crime. Even though, Hanninen explicitly teaches only one single victim using the "personal safety net" system of Hanninen. However, it would have been obvious that it is possible where a single crime involves multiple victims each using the "personal safety net" system.

Regarding claim 7, Applicant argues that Hanninen does not teach or suggest recording incident data in response to receiving a signal or information from a remote device. However, the Examiner respectfully disagrees.

More specifically, the Examiner submits that Hanninen teaches an emergency mode of the "personal safety net" system" in response to the activation of a "panic button" on the mobile terminal 120 by the victim (i.e. request signal associated with an incident) (see Hanninen, col. 4, lines 45-47). Hanninen also teaches that during such an emergency mode, an interactive control program allows police to control the operations of the mobile terminal 120 and to control the camera operation of the external camera 110 via mobile terminal 120 (see Hanninen, col. 4, lines 50-56). Finally, Hanninen teaches the recording activation of the external camera 110 is effected by the police (see Hanninen, col. 5, lines 17-18).

Therefore, the Examiner submits that Hanninen teaches recording data (recording activation of the external camera 110) in response to detecting a request

signal from a remote device (panic button on the mobile terminal 120) or receiving information from the remote device.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Wen W. Huang whose telephone number is (571) 272-7852. The examiner can normally be reached on 10am - 6pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Nay A. Maung can be reached on (571) 272-7882. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

  
3-15-07  
Lana N. Le  
Primary Examiner  
Technology Center 2600

wwh  
3/13/07